

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain in the application. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In the only rejection, claims 1-13 are rejected for anticipation by Stern. This rejection is respectfully traversed, for all of the reasons set forth in the response filed May 13, 2004, and in addition the further comments below.

The present invention is directed to a technique for simplifying the connections needed to handle multiple antennas each covering a respective area. The simplification is achieved according to the present invention by organizing the antennas into groups and then handling the antennas as a group. For example, the two antennas 161 and 162 in Fig. 4 are treated as a group, and they receive a common input at 301. A conventional system might allow antennas 161 and 162 to simultaneously use the same combination of frequency, polarization, code, etc., for two different transmissions, but according to the invention there would be no re-use within a group but only between groups. Another way of expressing this is that in a conventional system antenna 162 would have all of the system resources available to it, and antenna 161 would have all of the system resources available to it, etc., but in a system according to the invention the group of 161 and 162 would have all of the system resources available to the group, but antenna 161 may not have available to it a resource that is being used by antenna 162. This allocation of all system resources to each group (instead of each antenna) is reflected in the last subparagraph of claim 1.

Stern discloses an arrangement wherein there are two systems, an X system and an M system, and these two systems provide service to the same geographical area. It appears that the examiner may be taking the position that each of the X-system base stations covers an area, but there is no discussion of combining the signals from these areas into groups. They are all part of the same system, e.g., the X system, but there is no discussion of combining the signals from multiple base stations into groups. Further, if the treatment of all X-system signals is considered by the examiner as a "grouping," and the treatment of all M system signals is another "grouping," a problem is that the M system base stations cover the same areas as the X-system base stations, which is contrary to the language of claim 1. Further, and more importantly, the X-system signals are not allocated all of the communication resources of the region, since they do not have available to them the communication resources of the M system, which are in the same region.

It is clear that Stern does not teach or suggest the invention disclosed in the present application. The examiner has attempted to read the claim language on Stern, but in doing so has had to ignore certain requirements of the claims. Claim 1 requires that each group be allocated all of the communication resources of the region. In Stern, the X-system group does not have available to it the resources of the M-system group, and the rejection immediately fails.

For the above reasons, it is clear that claim 1 and therefore its dependent claims 2-13 patentably distinguish over Stern. Detailed discussion of the dependent claims is unnecessary, but it is worth at least briefly noting that:

Stern does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 3, since lines 15-27 of column 5 cited by the examiner say nothing about trying to have the traffic in the X

system be substantially the same as in the M system. There is a statement that the X-system 102 may have a desired traffic load, but not that it should be the same as the M-system 101. To the contrary, it states that all incoming traffic is processed by the M-system 101 while outgoing traffic is split between the two systems. This is a clear design attempt to have the traffic handled by the M-system 101 greater than in the X-system 102.

The examiner has not even attempted to identify support in Stern for the subject matter of claim 4. There is no suggestion in Stern that an area may be transferred from the M-system 101 to the X-system 102. This may be due to the fact that both systems appear to already cover all areas, so the subject matter of claim 4 makes no sense at all in the context of Stern.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 4, 2007

/DJCushing/
David J. Cushing
Registration No. 28,703